

### REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Final Office Action mailed June 13, 2007.

Initially, the Examiner objected to various claims including claims 10, 13, 21-22, 36-47, and 48. In claim 10, Applicant has amended the claim such that the objection is now moot. Regarding claim 13, Applicant has cancelled this claim. Similarly, Applicant has cancelled claim 21. Regarding claim 22, Applicant states, while it may contain the same limitation as claim 19, claim 19 is an entirely separate independent claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide additional comments regarding this rejection so Applicant can adequately address the objection if it is being maintained.

Similarly, the Examiner objected to claims 36-47 stating that these claims appear to have the same limitations as claims 34-35. Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this objection. Claims 36-47 are a separate set of claims than claims 34-35, which ultimately depend from an entirely different independent claim, claim 25. Regarding claim 48, Applicant has amended the dependency of claim 48 such that claim 48 no longer depends from claim 36, but instead depends from claim 47.

Next, the Examiner rejected various claims, including claims 4, 19, 22, 24, 36, 49, and 53 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended each of these claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicant has amended claim 4 such that pre-selecting a supplier link causes a rollover window to display information corresponding to the pre-selected supplier link. Regarding the remaining claims (claims 19, 22, 24, 36, 49, and 53), Applicant has amended each of these claims to overcome the present rejection by replacing the phrase of concern with the term "server."

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 11, 20 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Regarding claims 2 and 20, the Examiner has essentially the same concern. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that there was insufficient antecedent basis for "the domain name" and "the directory Web site domain name." Applicant respectfully submits that because this term refers to a portion of the Internet address, namely the portion of the address immediately preceding the top level domain such as .com, .org, or

.net in the Internet address, this term inherently had antecedent basis. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended each of these claims to explicitly state, for example, that the directory Web site includes a domain name portion.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, Applicant has amended the claim to address the Examiner's concerns to the extent Applicant understands the Examiner's concerns. Applicant requests that the Examiner provide additional feedback regarding the rejection if Applicant's present amendments to the claim do not fully address the Examiner's concerns with claim 11. Regarding the "at least in part" recitation of claim 11, Applicant has amended the claim to overcome this basis for the rejection. Finally, Applicant has amended claim 52 to overcome the present rejection.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected all of the claims as obvious. The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-17, 22-34, 36-46, and 48-54 as obvious over Rebane, U.S. Patent No. 6,662,192, in view of Fenton, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194151. The Examiner rejected the remaining claims, claims 7, 18-21, 35 and 47, as obvious over Rebane in view of Fenton and further in view of Perkes, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194601.

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that the primary reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,662,192, does not disclose in Fig. 18, a directory Web site address where a portion of the directory Web site address describes the class of goods or services. Instead, the Examiner utilizes a non-prior art recent print off of the BizRate.com Web site to supplement the lack of teaching in the '192 patent to Rebane to conclude that the disclosure in Rebane clearly teaches this limitation. Significantly, each of these printouts, which were apparently printed on May 30, 2007, are not prior art to the present application. The present application was originally filed on August 23, 2001.

Similarly, the Examiner supplements the teaching of Rebane with a current example of BizRate.com for purposes of showing that the Web site displays a separate window with the supplier's Web site. As discussed above, the current displays of what is offered by BizRate.com are not prior art to the present application. Accordingly, they cannot be applied

to supplement the teachings of the '192 patent to Rebane. Moreover, if the Examiner intends to base the rejection on an assertedly inherent disclosure of the '192 patent, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not appropriate as the assertedly present features are not necessarily present in the '192 patent. "The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic." M.P.E.P. § 2112; *In re Rijchaert*, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. and Inter. 1990) (emphasis original).

Additionally, with respect to claims 2 and 20, the cited references, even as supplemented by the Examiner with the non-prior art print offs, do not disclose the invention of these claims. The Examiner asserts that Rebane discloses a directory Web site (BizRate.com). "BizRate" is the domain name portion of the Internet address. Accordingly, when the domain name section defines the class of goods or services, the class of goods or services presumably would be "business rating" in the case of Fig. 18 of the '192 patent. However, the various links listed in Fig. 18 of Rebane, such as "e-cost.com," do not activate a supplier Web site that offers the services of business rating services, but rather presumably these businesses offered PDA products. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that at least these claims (and any claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over the cited references for at least this additional reason.

Finally, the Examiner has made a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, which will be addressed at a later date if the rejection is made non-provisional.

Applicant : Michael Meiresonne  
Appln. No. : 09/938,163  
Page 21

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (616) 949-9610.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL MEIRESONNE

By: PRICE, HENEVELD, COOPER,  
DEWITT & LITTON, LLP

September 13, 2007  
Date



Todd A. Van Thomme  
Registration No. 44 285  
695 Kenmoor SE  
P.O. Box 2567  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-2567  
616/949-9610

TAV/dar